

Serial No. 10/692,620
Response dated February 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 1, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CS22507RL

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1 through 7 remain in this application. Claims 6 and 7 are allowed, and claims 1 through 5 are pending.

Claim 5 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would otherwise be allowable. Accordingly, claim 5 is hereby rewritten in independent form to include all limitations of independent claim 1. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the objection to claim 5 are respectfully requested.

Claims 1, 3 and 4 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0157638 to Moran, et al. ("Moran, et al. publication"). Also, claim 2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over the Moran, et al. publication in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,654,841 to Lin ("Lin patent").

Claim 1 provides a USB device comprising, *inter alia*, two processors. In particular, a first processor is configured as a Universal Serial Bus device to provide a first set of services to an external host; and a second processor, coupled to said first processor *as a Universal Serial Bus host* and coupled to a Universal Serial Bus device connector suitable for connection to said external host, is configured to provide a second set of services to said external host, and configured to pass service data bi-directionally between said first processor and said external host for said first set of services [emphasis added]. Thus, the second processor is coupled to the first processor as a USB host via the USB connection between the two processors (see page 6, lines 11 through 14, of the specification).

Serial No. 10/692,620
Response dated February 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 1, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CS22507RJ-

In contrast, the Moran, et al. publication describes an existing type of USB connection between a host and a device based on the existing USB specification. FIG. 9 of the Moran, et al. publication, and the corresponding description at paragraphs [0179] and [0180], suggest that a CPU 924 facilitates access to a flash module 906. The CPU 924 supports USB enumeration with external USB devices connected to USB connector 922. The Moran, et al. publication does not describe or suggest any type of USB connection among components of the telephone 920, including the interconnection between the CPU 924 and CPU 926, so the CPU 924 does not describe or suggest one processor connected to another processor as a USB host, as required by claim 1. Likewise, the Lin patent does not describe or suggest one processor connected to another processor as a USB host, as required by claim 1. Therefore, claim 1 distinguishes patentably from the Moran, et al. publication, the Lin patent and the suggested combination of these references.

Claims 2 through 4 depend from and include all limitations of independent claim 1. Therefore, claims 2 through 4 distinguish patentably from the Moran, et al. publication, the Lin patent and the suggested combination of these references for the reasons stated above for claim 1.

In view of the above, reconsideration and withdrawal of the 35 U.S.C. §102(e) and 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejections of claim 1 through 4 are respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

No amendment made was related to the statutory requirements of patentability unless expressly stated herein. Also, no amendment made was for the purpose of narrowing the scope

Serial No. 10/692,620
Response dated February 3, 2006
Reply to Office Action of December 1, 2005

Attorney Docket No. CS22507RL

of any claim, unless Applicant has argued herein that such amendment was made to distinguish over a particular reference or combination of references.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to deduct any additional fees arising as a result of this response, including any fees for Extensions of Time, or any other communication from or to credit any overpayments to Deposit Account No. 50-2117.

It is submitted that the claims clearly define the invention, are supported by the specification and drawings, and are in a condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. Should the Examiner have any questions or concerns that may expedite prosecution of the present application, the Examiner is encouraged to telephone the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,
Huang, Aiping

Please forward all correspondence to:
Motorola, Inc.
Law Department (HDW)
600 North US Highway 45, AS437
Libertyville, IL 60048



02/03/06

Hisashi D. Watanabe
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 37,465
Telephone: (847) 523-2322
Facsimile: (847) 523-2350

Date